Harold Weisberg
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
4/21/75

Mr. Jack Booth
Philadelphia Bulletin
Phila.,Pa.

Dear Mr. Booth,

Is it merely that a transcript of one Warren Commission transcript "was released to the public last year following a lengthy Freedom of Information suit by one of the conspiracy theorists" that you were able to quote from this transcript in the April 11 Bulletin, clips from which I have just received?

With more than 150 square inches of space you could not identify the book, the only book, in which the full ttanscript appears in facsimile? You had plenty of room for crap, error and Arlen Specter's propaganda.

In fact, if you had read the book and the transcript (flyer enclosed) you'd have been aware of some of your error.

Error is one of the hazards of reporting. Most reporters seek to avoid it by speaking to original sources.

It is not my purpose to argue, nor to remind anyone on the Bulletin that it has not seen fit to speak to the one author who has done much more work and much more publishing than any other, even on his once-frequent visits to Philadelphia. I am, in fact, the one author who has worked -and intensively - in this field from the first. There is virtually no fact of any significance that was not first published in my (six) printed books. And none that to this moment has been refuted by any official, especially Specter, whose work I addressed as no other has. This includes the violent backward JFK motion. I published this before Thompson started his popularization.

(If it interest you, ask Thompson if there is any source other than my second book in which this appears he once quoted in his general footnote reading, approx., "According to a document recently discovered in the National Archives. It is my recollection that each and every such citation is exactly this cribbing.)

That man on the grassy knoll? There is one. Whether or not he has a rifle is another matter. But his presence and the possibility of a rifle is in my very earliest work, not just now for the first time. Itek confirmed the man but not the rifle for LIFE in 1967. My analysis comes from a published still picture.

You call me, without naming me, "one of the conspiracy theorists." That, sir, is close to libel! In about a million printed words the one thing you won't find is me theorizing. I deal with fact What made me decide to open the subject with the first "underground" book is the offer of a major publisher to publish the first book if I would reangle it around a theory that the government did the conspiring. I refused. (In confidence, W.W.Norton.) I am the one who close to alone not only does not theorize in print but has nothing to do with any of those calling themselves "conspiracy theorists."

You repeat this kind of error - not the only kind - in"The vast majority ["current contentions"], however, turn out to be mere reruns of a flurry of theories that reached a fever pitch in late 1966." These actually, aside from nonsense, are reruns of my first two books which do no theorizing and are based entirely on cited official documents, some reprinted in facsimile. There is a difference between what you describe, I presume from the AIB ripoff of pocket and mind and the current TV attention to the equivalent of freaks in side shows, and solid work that papers like yours have ignored.

There also was no "lengthy" suit. There was a years-long effort I made, not for that alone. (I've filed five suits and the one I lost I am now winning, Congress having amended the law with it specifically cited as a need. Sound like "conspiracy theorist?") There was no single in-court proceeding of any kind. And I know of no case in which a plaintiff proved a negative against the government or prevailed over it on the question of fact when it invoked "national defense."

If Specter told you that Bobby Kennedy withheld anything from the Commission he lied. The fact is that it was his obligation as ~~axxiny~~ the lawyer handling that part to present the "best evidence." If he told you he saw no film - and if Bobby withheld it how could he have seen any? - then he also lied.

There is no "new crop" of those you call "critics." Groden's work is not new. What is new is the attention. It also shows nothing new. Groden's expertise is limited to photo optics.

There is much that is "new" but I lack the funds to print it.

However, to this day I have not had any allegation made to me - including by Specter - that there is any error in this "old" that I first brought out a decade ago. In an effort to break through the prejudices of the major media, after making serious charges against Specter and daring him to sue, I went to Philadelphia and made these charges in public. I did phone your paper. It was not there. And Specter has not and will not sue.

He could have charged me where he was DA and when he was DA. He dared not.

This also is how I got that transcript, with the voluntary laying of my head on the block. It was not simple "released."

Too bad it has to be this way. There are better ways to live.

But when I do run these risks it is not comforting or in any way rewarding or reassuring to read the kind of stories you wrote. Or to be aware of your censoring.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg